

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant and Inventor
Filing Date
Application Number
Group Art Unit
Examiner
H.K. Tel & FAX
Email

Ho Keung, TSE.
07/09/98
08/587,448
2132
Gilberto Barron Jr.
(852) 8105, 1090 & (852) 8105, 1091
t9224@netscape.net



Date : Feb 30, 2003

By Fax

Hon. Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231.

Sir,

Second Response to Advisory Action of Jan 13, 2003

Comments on Patentability of Claim 1

In the Final Office action, P.4 , section 6, the Examiner rejects Claim 1 as being unpatentable over Wiedemer in view of Haas et al (issued on Feb 17, 1998, filing date Aug 1, 1994) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

The Examiner also states that, in the Final Office action, P.2, section 3, "it is the claims that are to distinguish from the prior art and not that the prior art operates differently".

The Examiner's rejection is respectfully traversed, for the following reasons :

As readable on column 5, lines 47-54, Haas et al. merely teach a deterrent as causing by a software, a rightful user's credit card number to be displayed, to discourage a rightful user from sharing ^{another} the software which being for decrypting a commercial software product, to other people. This deterrent although may be useful, it has a drawback that the rightful user have to make sure ^{another} no other people is around before he can use the software.

The present invention as claimed by claim 1 is directed to a method for protecting